

Characterizing, Mapping and Applying Level III and IV Ecoregions in New England for Integrated Ecosystem Assessment and Management

Greg Hellyer


EPA- New England Regional Laboratory

NEAEB – Mapping Session 1A

March 17, 2010



“The whole is more than the sum of its parts”



- Aristotle (~350 B.C.)
Metaphysica 10f-1045a

“Two streams of science – one reductive and certain, and one integrative and uncertain. The first provides the bricks for the edifice, but not the architectural design”



- C.S. (Buzz) Holling

Emeritus Eminent Scholar and Professor in Ecological Sciences at the University of Florida and ‘father’ of concepts of [resilience](#), [adaptive management](#), the [adaptive cycle](#), and [panarchy](#).

Rationale for Ecoregion Project (Single Resource vs. Ecosystem View)

- Federal and state agencies and NGOs have traditionally focused assessment, research, monitoring, and management on single resources (e.g. streams, lakes, wetlands, wildlife, fish, forests, grasslands or agriculture);
- However, an holistic, ecosystem (ecoregional) perspective is needed, given the inextricably interconnected nature of environmental processes and problems; Ecosystems and ecoregions exhibit emergent, non-linear, complex, panarchic* properties;


*"Panarchy is the hierarchy of adaptive cycles that form the basis of ecosystems and social-ecological systems across time/space scales."

(www.globaldiversityfund.net/glossary/1/letterp)

Specific Purpose Regions vs. General Purpose Ecoregions


- **Specific Purpose Regions** are based on patterns of one characteristic and spatial associations with causal or reflective geographical phenomena (e.g. alkalinity, soils, or geology regions);
- **General Purpose Ecoregions** are based on spatial coincidence of numerous geographic phenomena affecting or reflecting ecosystem characteristics;

Specific to General Purpose Lake Management Hierarchy



Source: Ecoregions, watersheds, basins, and HUCs: How state and federal agencies frame water quality (Griffith and others 1999)

TOTAL PHOSPHORUS REGIONS FOR THE LAKES IN THE NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES



Source: (Rohm and others 1995)

Definition of EPA Ecoregions

- Areas of similarity regarding patterns in the mosaic of abiotic and biotic, aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem components, including geology, physiography, vegetation, climate, soils, hydrology, land use, and wildlife, with humans being considered as part of the biota;
- The relative importance of each characteristic varies from one ecological region to another regardless of the hierarchical level.

Omernik, J.M. (1995) Ecoregions: A spatial framework for environmental management, in Biological assessment and criteria: tools for water resource planning and decision making, pp. 49-62.

EPA Ecoregions and Ecosystem Management

- Ecoregions denote areas of general similarity in ecosystems and in the type, quality, and quantity of environmental resources;
- Spatial differences in the capacities and potentials of ecosystems and ecoregions stratify the environment by its probable response to disturbance (Bryce and others, 1999).

Bryce, S.A., Omernik, J.M., and Larsen, D.P., 1999, Ecoregions – a geographic framework to guide risk characterization and ecosystem management. Environmental Practice, v. 1, no. 3, p. 141-155.

EPA Ecoregions and Ecosystem Management (cont'd)

- EPA ecoregions were not designed to serve a single purpose or to optimally correspond to patterns of specific environmental components such as fish, macroinvertebrates, soils, or vegetation;
- Ecoregions do correspond well to water quality, which integrates multiple environmental factors;

Gallant, A. L., T. R. Whittier, et al. (1989). Regionalization as a tool for managing environmental resources: Corvallis, Oregon, US Environmental Protection Agency, EPA/600/3-89/060, 152 p.

Hierarchical Nesting of EPA Ecoregions

- The four (4) EPA ecoregional hierarchical Levels do not perfectly ‘nest’, given boundary uncertainty and variation at different mapping scales;
- For mapping purposes ecoregional Levels are shown hierarchically nested;

Common 15 Level I Ecoregions of N. America (CEC 1997)



ECOLOGICAL REGIONS OF NORTH AMERICA
RÉGIONS ÉCOLOGIQUES DE L'AMÉRIQUE DU NORD

Level 10 Niveau 10 Niveau 10

Scale 1:100,000 Échelle 1:100,000 Échelle 1:100,000

Legend

1. Tundra

2. Subarctic forest

3. Boreal forest

4. Temperate forest

5. Desert

6. Steppe

7. Grassland

8. Shrubland

9. Wetland

10. Coastal

11. Mountain

12. Plateau

13. Basin

14. Valley

15. Ridge

16. Peak

17. Slope

18. Plain

19. Desert

20. Steppe

21. Grassland

22. Shrubland

23. Wetland

24. Coastal

25. Mountain

26. Plateau

27. Basin

28. Valley

29. Ridge

30. Peak

31. Slope

32. Plain

33. Desert

34. Steppe

35. Grassland

36. Shrubland

37. Wetland

38. Coastal

39. Mountain

40. Plateau

41. Basin

42. Valley

43. Ridge

44. Peak

45. Slope

46. Plain

47. Desert

48. Steppe

49. Grassland

50. Shrubland

51. Wetland

52. Coastal

53. Mountain

54. Plateau

55. Basin

56. Valley

57. Ridge

58. Peak

59. Slope

60. Plain

61. Desert

62. Steppe

63. Grassland

64. Shrubland

65. Wetland

66. Coastal

67. Mountain

68. Plateau

69. Basin

70. Valley

71. Ridge

72. Peak

73. Slope

74. Plain

75. Desert

76. Steppe

77. Grassland

78. Shrubland

79. Wetland

80. Coastal

81. Mountain

82. Plateau

83. Basin

84. Valley

85. Ridge

86. Peak

87. Slope

88. Plain

89. Desert

90. Steppe

91. Grassland

92. Shrubland

93. Wetland

94. Coastal

95. Mountain

96. Plateau

97. Basin

98. Valley

99. Ridge

100. Peak

101. Slope

102. Plain

103. Desert

104. Steppe

105. Grassland

106. Shrubland

107. Wetland

108. Coastal

109. Mountain

110. Plateau

111. Basin

112. Valley

113. Ridge

114. Peak

115. Slope

116. Plain

117. Desert

118. Steppe

119. Grassland

120. Shrubland

121. Wetland

122. Coastal

123. Mountain

124. Plateau

125. Basin

126. Valley

127. Ridge

128. Peak

129. Slope

130. Plain

131. Desert

132. Steppe

133. Grassland

134. Shrubland

135. Wetland

136. Coastal

137. Mountain

138. Plateau

139. Basin

140. Valley

141. Ridge

142. Peak

143. Slope

144. Plain

145. Desert

146. Steppe

147. Grassland

148. Shrubland

149. Wetland

150. Coastal

151. Mountain

152. Plateau

153. Basin

154. Valley

155. Ridge

156. Peak

157. Slope

158. Plain

159. Desert

160. Steppe

161. Grassland

162. Shrubland

163. Wetland

164. Coastal

165. Mountain

166. Plateau

167. Basin

168. Valley

169. Ridge

170. Peak

171. Slope

172. Plain

173. Desert

174. Steppe

175. Grassland

176. Shrubland

177. Wetland

178. Coastal

179. Mountain

180. Plateau

181. Basin

182. Valley

183. Ridge

184. Peak

185. Slope

186. Plain

187. Desert

188. Steppe

189. Grassland

190. Shrubland

191. Wetland

192. Coastal

193. Mountain

194. Plateau

195. Basin

196. Valley

197. Ridge

198. Peak

199. Slope

200. Plain

201. Desert

202. Steppe

203. Grassland

204. Shrubland

205. Wetland

206. Coastal

207. Mountain

208. Plateau

209. Basin

210. Valley

211. Ridge

212. Peak

213. Slope

214. Plain

215. Desert

216. Steppe

217. Grassland

218. Shrubland

219. Wetland

220. Coastal

221. Mountain

222. Plateau

223. Basin

224. Valley

225. Ridge

226. Peak

227. Slope

228. Plain

229. Desert

230. Steppe

231. Grassland

232. Shrubland

233. Wetland

234. Coastal

235. Mountain

236. Plateau

237. Basin

238. Valley

239. Ridge

240. Peak

241. Slope

242. Plain

243. Desert

244. Steppe

245. Grassland

246. Shrubland

247. Wetland

248. Coastal

249. Mountain

250. Plateau

251. Basin

252. Valley

253. Ridge

254. Peak

255. Slope

256. Plain

257. Desert

258. Steppe

259. Grassland

260. Shrubland

261. Wetland

262. Coastal

263. Mountain

264. Plateau

265. Basin

266. Valley

267. Ridge

268. Peak

269. Slope

270. Plain

271. Desert

272. Steppe

273. Grassland

274. Shrubland

275. Wetland

276. Coastal

277. Mountain

278. Plateau

279. Basin

280. Valley

281. Ridge

282. Peak

283. Slope

284. Plain

285. Desert

286. Steppe

287. Grassland

288. Shrubland

289. Wetland

290. Coastal

291. Mountain

292. Plateau

293. Basin

294. Valley

295. Ridge

296. Peak

297. Slope

298. Plain

299. Desert

300. Steppe

301. Grassland

302. Shrubland

303. Wetland

304. Coastal

305. Mountain

306. Plateau

307. Basin

308. Valley

309. Ridge

310. Peak

311. Slope

312. Plain

313. Desert

314. Steppe

315. Grassland

316. Shrubland

317. Wetland

318. Coastal

319. Mountain

320. Plateau

321. Basin

322. Valley

323. Ridge

324. Peak

325. Slope

326. Plain

327. Desert

328. Steppe

329. Grassland

330. Shrubland

331. Wetland

332. Coastal

333. Mountain

334. Plateau

335. Basin

336. Valley

337. Ridge

338. Peak

339. Slope

340. Plain

341. Desert

342. Steppe

343. Grassland

344. Shrubland


345. Wetland

346. Coastal


347. Mountain

348. Plateau</

Common 182 Level III Ecoregions of N. America (CEC 1997)




84 Level III Ecoregions of the Lower 48 States (EPA 2006)




Slightly revised in USEPA (2009)

EPA (2006) Level III and IV Ecoregions of Conterminous United States



Status of EPA Level IV Mapping in Lower 48 States (March, 2007)


- Level IV ecoregions are mapped for ~85% of the conterminous U.S., but not for the Northeast (NY, NJ, and New England);



Bailey's (1994) Ecoregions of New England (Sections)

- St. Lawrence Valley;
- Green, Taconic, Berkshire Mountains;
- New England Piedmont
- White Mountains;
- Aroostook Hills & Lowland
- Maine & New Brunswick Foothills & Central Lowlands;
- Fundy Coastal & Interior;
- Central ME Coastal & Interior;
- Lower New England;


Bailey's Ecoregions of New England



EPA Level III Ecoregions of New England (2006)

- #83 Eastern Great Lakes
Hudson Lowlands;
- #58 Northeastern
Highlands;
- #82 Laurentian Plains and
Hills;
- #59 Northeastern Coastal
Zone;
- #84 Atlantic Coastal Pine
Barrens;


EPA Level III Ecoregions of New England



Delineation of EPA Ecoregions

- Ecoregions are not self-evident but require a focused multi-disciplinary discovery of their intrinsic spatial patterns;
- EPA ecoregions are not simply the overlaying of GIS coverages;
- EPA uses a weight-of-evidence approach which identifies congruent aquatic, terrestrial and human landscape patterns;

- 5 Level III ecoregions;
- 40 Level IV ecoregions;
- Compiled at a scale of 1:250,000;
- High ecological & landscape diversity



Summary of State & Federal Ecoregional Applications in the Lower 48 States

Some State and Federal Applications of Ecoregions in the Lower 48 States - January 4, 2008
Greg Hellyer, USEPA – New England Regional Lab (hellyer.greg@epa.gov)

Page 1 of 43

State or Federal Agency	Some Applications of Ecoregions
LOWER 48 STATES	
Alabama	River and Stream Level IV Ecoregional Reference Sites 216.226.179.150/fieldops/monitoring/surfacestrategies/riverstream.htm#Core
Alabama	Alabama's Draft 2008 Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters and Comments on Alabama's Draft Assessment and Listing Methodology www.adem.state.al.us/PublicNotice/Aug/8Meth.htm
Alabama	Alabama's Water Quality Assessment and Listing Methodology www.adem.state.al.us/PublicNotice/Aug/Meth.pdf
Alabama	Water Quality Standards www.adem.state.al.us/waterdivision/WQuality/305b/2006/2006%20AL%20WQMAR%20Ch1%20(Water%20Quality%20Standards).pdf
Alabama	1998 305(b) Report to Congress 216.226.179.150/waterdivision/wquality/305b/1998/1998.htm
Alabama	2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring & Assessment Report 216.226.179.150/waterdivision/wquality/305b/2004report/2004.htm
Alabama	319 Reporting 216.226.179.150/education%20div/nonpoint%20program/npsgrant/fy04%20and%20future%20year%20proposal%20workplan%20template%20%28rev.3%2D22%2D04%29.doc
Alabama	2006 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report 216.226.179.150/waterdivision/wquality/305b/WQ305bReport.htm
Arizona	Associating wildlife with different ecoregions for management www.azgfd.gov/w_c/wcws_format.shtml

I compiled 43 page annotated draft summary of State & Federal Ecoregional Applications in the Lower 48 States

Some State, Federal & NGO Ecoregional Applications in Lower 48 States (see poster)

- Monitoring of aquatic biota (e.g. fish, benthic macroinvertebrates, zooplankton, periphyton, algae);
- Identifying reference conditions and developing indices of ecological health and integrity (e.g. Index of Biological Integrity - IBI, Index of Biological Wellness - IBW, Tiered Aquatic Life Uses - TALU, Biological Condition Gradient - BCG, and Water Quality Index - WQI);

Some Examples of Ecoregional Applications

- Developing narrative and numeric biological criteria, water quality criteria and standards, and nutrient criteria for streams, rivers, lakes, reservoirs and wetlands;
- Development and monitoring of TMDLs;
- 305(b)/303(d) and Integrated Reporting;
- Basin assessment, facilities permitting and waste management;
- Statistical and spatial/geographic assessment and modeling (e.g. REMAP/ EMAP data: wadeable streams, lakes and ponds, large rivers and wetlands);


Some Examples of Ecoregional Applications (cont'd)

- Large-scale monitoring of aquatic communities; Ecosystem assessment of watersheds;
- Identifying Target Fish Communities (TFC) and fisheries restoration goals;
- Assessment and classification of streams, rivers, and lakes;
- Development of state Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies (CWCS);
- Identifying critical habitat to preserve biodiversity;

Some Examples of Ecoregional Applications (cont'd)

- Park land acquisition and planning; Conservation and recreational planning for birds, fish and aquatic communities;
- Wetland protection including planning, permitting, mitigation and determining reference conditions;
- Land cover status and trends; Assessing urbanization; Highway and road planning; Bacterial source tracking;


Status and Trends of Eastern United States Land Cover



- 1) Where is change occurring;
- 2) What land cover types are changing;
- 3) Types of transformation occurring;
- 4) Rates or amounts of land change;
- 5) Driving forces and proximate causes of change;


Source: <http://edc2.usgs.gov/LT/coverpage.php>

Overall Spatial Change in all Eastern U.S. Ecoregions




Northeastern Coastal Zone (Ecoregion 59)

- The Northeastern Coastal Zone's Land Cover Trends sample blocks (the black hollow 10 km x 10 squares) overlay the USGS 1992 National Land Cover Database;




Estimated Net Percentage Change by Land Cover Class (Ecoregion 59)



Level III & IV Ecoregions - MA, RI, CT (1994)

Level III and IV Ecoregions of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut



- Landscape & process changes required updating of MA;
- CT & RI never endorsed project & products;


MA Use of Level IV Ecoregions

- MADEP found EPA's Level IV mapping extremely informative in selecting reference streams for biological assessment (TetraTech 2001);
- This furthered development of biological criteria for the state's streams and small rivers, through sampling of their fish and benthic macroinvertebrate communities;

MA Use of Level IV Ecoregions (cont'd)

- In 2001, the MA Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (MANHESP) completed BioMap;
- BioMap was designed to identify and protect Massachusetts's biodiversity by including "adequate representation from each of the 13 ecoregions" identified by EPA;

MANHESP BioMap



MA Use of Level IV Ecoregions (cont'd)

- BioMap identified Core Habitat and supporting natural landscapes, most critical for protection and maintenance of biodiversity.
- MANHESP Living Waters project furthered this goal focusing on protection of MA freshwater biodiversity;

Our Irreplaceable Heritage: Protecting Biodiversity in Massachusetts (1998);


- From 1950 to 2000, the population of MA increased 28%, area of developed land increased 200%;
- Compared development rates in two MA ecoregions: Connecticut River Valley and the Worcester Plateau; development often follows geology and topography;
- Recommended that MA identify “an equitable distribution of biologically viable conservation lands at all topographic elevations and across all ecoregions” (MA CWCS 2005);

Classification of the Natural Communities of Massachusetts (2001)

- “Sub-ecoregions ... are particularly useful for statewide ecological inventory and assessment activities, including vegetation classification” (Swain and Kearsley 2001);
- “In the vegetation classification, each community description is accompanied by a sub-ecoregion line map showing the sub-ecoregion boundaries”;



Level IV Ecoregions and MA Natural Community Classification

- Level IV ecoregions in which community type is known to occur shaded **dark gray**;
- Level IV ecoregions with probable occurrences shaded in **light gray**;
- Level IV ecoregion in which community is not believed to occur is left **white** (Swain and Kearley 2001)



Spruce-Fir Boreal Swamp -
Forested wetlands of
Berkshire Highlands and
north-central Massachusetts
dominated by red spruce and
balsam fir.

MANHESP BioMap and Living Waters Ecoregional Publications




Source: <http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhesp/nhpubs.htm>

S. New England Target Fish Community (TFC) Development

- “Define the fish community that is appropriate for a natural river in southern New England” (Bain and Meixler 2000);
- Maintain biological integrity defined as “a balanced, integrated, adaptive community” (Karr, 1991);
- Identify impaired community using sampling and metrics and set fisheries management goals based on reference rivers and habitats;

Target Fish Community (TFC) Development in MA, CT & NH

- Applied Bain and Meixler's (2000) TFC to Upper and Lower Souhegan R. (NH), Lamprey R. (NH), Charles R. (MA), Ipswich R. (MA) and Quinebaug R. (MA/CT);



Souhegan R. Representative Sites
and Level III Ecoregions

MADEP Applications of TFC

- TFC shows MA river fish communities are being impacted by water quality and quantity and habitat alteration;
 - Fisheries-Based Watershed Management Plans;
 - Coldwater Fishery Resource (CFR) Designations;
 - Water Quality Standards (DEP);
 - USGS Publications;
 - State Wildlife Grants;
 - Sustainable Forestry;
 - NFHI/EBT Joint Venture;


Source: *Restoring Massachusetts Rivers: Habitat and Fluvial Fish* (Todd Richards, MADFW)
<http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/river/pdf/flowconfrichards.pdf>

65 Potential Lamprey River Reference Rivers in EPA Level III Ecoregion 59

•Zoogeographically & Geophysically Similar Rivers:


Key:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Byram River | 33. Pawcatuck River |
| 2. Rippowan River | 34. Wood River |
| 3. Norwalk River | 35. South Branch Pawtuxet River |
| 4. Saugatuck River | 36. Pawtuxet River |
| 5. Mill River | 37. Ten Mile River |
| 6. Upper Still River | 38. Branch River |
| 7. Still River | 39. Blackstone River |
| 8. Shepaug River | 40. Mill River |
| 9. Naugatuck River | 41. Town River |
| 10. West River | 42. Taunton River |
| 11. Farmington River | 43. North River |
| 12. Quinnipiac River | 44. Neponset River |
| 13. Little River | 45. Charles River |
| 14. Munn Brook | 46. Sudbury River |
| 15. West Branch Farmington River | 47. Assabet River |
| 16. Mattabesset River | 48. Nashua River |
| 17. Stony Brook | 49. Nissitissit River |
| 18. Manhan River | 50. Shawsheen River |
| 19. Mill River | 51. Ipswich River |
| 20. Fort River | 52. Souhegan River |
| 21. Salmon River | 53. Cohas Brook |
| 22. Eightmile River | 54. Turkey River |
| 23. Swift River | 55. Soucook River |
| 24. East Branch Swift River | 56. Suncook River |
| 25. Willimantic River | 57. Mile Brook |
| 26. Shetucket River | 58. North River |
| 27. Ware River | 59. Lamprey River |
| 28. Quaboag River | 60. Isinglass River |
| 29. Upper Quinebaug River | 61. Coheco River |
| 30. Quinebaug River | 62. Salmon Falls River |
| 31. French River | 63. Kennebunk River |
| 32. Fivemile River | 64. Pleasant River |
| | 65. Piscataqua River |




TFC for Upper and Lower Souhegan River, NH

- For the Souhegan River “[D]etermination of the zoogeographic similarity of areas is based on an analysis of geology, physiography, vegetation, climate, soils, land use, wildlife and hydrology to identify ecologically similar regions, or Ecoregions” (Legros 2005);




Six Level III Ohio Ecoregions



Level III ecoregion water sampling sites cluster with similar chemical concentrations (i.e. ionic strength and nutrient richness) in the following graph (Griffith et al. 1999)

Correspondence between Ohio Level III Ecoregions and Water Quality Spatial Pattern



Water Chemical Composition Differs between Level III Ohio Ecoregions

- The previous graph shows “..results of two principal components analyses of median stream values of ionic strength variables (conductivity, alkalinity, calcium, magnesium, and total hardness), and nutrient richness variables (total phosphorus; nitrate-, nitrite-, ammonia-, and Kjeldahl nitrogen; and total organic carbon) collected from the reference watersheds”(Griffith et al. 1999).

EPA-NE/NEIWPC State Workshop – Spring, 2010

- EPA-NE and NEIWPC are organizing a New England/New York state workshop for Spring, 2010 to illustrate how some states, such as Tennessee, have applied ecoregions in their water programs;
- Hope to have expert(s) from TN attend and continue as consulting resources for New England and New York state water programs interested in exploring ecoregional applications;

Some Tennessee (TN) Ecoregionally Based Reports


DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY-BASED NUMERIC INTERPRETATIONS OF TENNESSEE'S NARRATIVE BIOLOGICAL INTEGRITY CRITERION



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L & C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Numeric Biological Integrity Criterion

2006 305(b) Report The Status of Water Quality in Tennessee



Division of Water Pollution Control
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

2006 305(b) Report

Some TN Ecoregionally Based Reports (cont'd)

REGIONAL CHARACTERIZATION OF STREAMS IN TENNESSEE WITH EMPHASIS ON DIURNAL DISSOLVED OXYGEN, NUTRIENTS, HABITAT, GEOMORPHOLOGY AND MACROINVERTEBRATES



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L&C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Wadeable Stream Assessment

PROBABILISTIC MONITORING OF STREAMS BELOW SMALL IMPOUNDMENTS IN TENNESSEE



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L&C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Probabilistic Monitoring

Some TN Ecoregionally Based Reports (cont'd)

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY-BASED pH CRITERIA FOR WADEABLE STREAMS



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L&C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Devmt of Wadeable Stream pH Criteria

HABITAT QUALITY OF LEAST- IMPACTED STREAMS IN TENNESSEE



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L&C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Habitat Quality of Reference Streams

Some TN Ecoregionally Based Reports (cont'd)

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY-BASED INTERPRETATIONS OF TENNESSEE'S NARRATIVE NUTRIENT CRITERION



Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
Division of Water Pollution Control
7th Floor L & C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37243-1534

Narrative Nutrient Criteria

TENNESSEE'S PLAN FOR NUTRIENT CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT

Revised October, 2004



Planning and Standards Section
Division of Water Pollution Control
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
7th Floor, L & C Annex
401 Church Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1534

Nutrient Criteria Development

EPA's 14 Nutrient Ecoregions (2003)

*Draft Aggregations of Level III Ecoregions
for the National Nutrient Strategy*



Nutrient Criteria, Ecoregions and Reference Conditions

- Herlihy, A. T. and J. C. Sifneos (2008). *"Developing nutrient criteria and classification schemes for wadeable streams in the conterminous US."* Journal of the North American Benthological Society, 27(4): 932-948.
- Moore, A. and M. Hicks. 2004. *Nutrient Criteria Development in Washington State - Phosphorus*, Washington State Department of Ecology, Water Quality Program, Watershed Management Section, Publication Number 04-10-033, April 2004, 60 pp.
(<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/pubs/0410033.pdf>)

Nutrient Criteria, Ecoregions and Reference Conditions (cont'd)

- New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC). 2003. *Collection and Evaluation of Ambient Nutrient Data for Rivers and Streams in New England – Data Synthesis Report - Final Report*. A Cooperative Effort of NEIWPCC, USEPA – New England, ENSR International and New England States Regional Technical Advisory Team, September, 2003, 100 pp. (<http://www.neiwpcc.org/ncreports.asp>)
- New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC). 2001. *The Relationships Between Nutrient Concentrations and Periphyton Levels in Rivers and Streams - A Review of Scientific Literature*, Prepared by ENSR Corporation, Document Number: 4933-001-400, 60 pp. (<http://www.neiwpcc.org/ncreports.asp>)
- New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC). 2000. *Collection & Evaluation of Ambient Nutrient Data for Lakes, Ponds, and Reservoirs in New England – Data Synthesis Report – Interim Final Report*, Prepared by ENSR Corporation, April 2000, Document Number 8726-780-600, 87 pp. (<http://www.neiwpcc.org/ncreports.asp>)

Nutrient Criteria, Ecoregions and Reference Conditions (cont'd)

- Paul, M. J. and L. Zheng (2007). "*Development of Nutrient Endpoints for the Northern Piedmont Ecoregion of Pennsylvania: TMDL Application.*", Prepared for EPA Region 3 by TetraTech, Owings Mills, MD.
- Rohm, C. M., J. M. Omernik, et al. (2002). "*Regional characteristics of nutrient concentrations in streams and their application to nutrient criteria development.*" Journal of the American Water Resources Association, **38**(1): 213-240.
- Wickham, J. D., T. G. Wade, et al. (2008). "*Detecting temporal change in watershed nutrient yields.*" Environmental Management, 42(2): 223-231.

“Ecoregions of New England” - Endorsing Agencies and NGOs



• EPA-New England

• USGS  **USGS**
science for a changing world

• NRCS  **NRCS** Natural Resources Conservation Service

• CTDEP 



• RIDEM

• MADEP 

• ME Dept of Conservation



• MEDEP



• NHDES



• NH Fish and Game



• VTDEC



• VT Fish & Wildlife



• The Nature Conservancy











Ecoregions of New England – Principal Authors

- Glenn E. Griffith (Dynamac Corporation)
- James M. Omernik (USGS; EPA-retired)
- Sandra A. Bryce (Dynamac Corporation)
- Joshua Royte (The Nature Conservancy)
- Wayne D. Hoar (NRCS)
- Joseph W. Homer (NRCS),
- Don Keirstead (NRCS)
- Kenneth J. Metzler (CTDEP)
- Greg Hellyer (EPA-New England)



Agency Principal Collaborators & Contributors

- **Katrina Kipp** , Diane Switzer, Tom Faber, Lynne Hamjian & Tony Olsen (USEPA) 
- Caroline Alves (NRCS) 
- Andy Cutko (ME Natural Areas Program) 
- Dave Halliwell and Roy Bouchard (ME DEP) 
- Sue Gawler (NatureServe) 
- Mark Anderson (TNC) 
- Steve Fuller and Emily Brunkhurst (NHFG) 
- Rick Chormann (NHDES) 
- Rich Langdon (VTDEC) 
- Leif Richardson, Everett Marshall & Eric Sorensen (VTFW) 
- Lisa Wahle and Guy Hoffman (CT DEP) 
- Robert Haynes and Pat Swain (MADEP) 
- John Hutchinson, Jack Wittmann & Tom Loveland (USGS) 

(My sincere apologies that not all those involved can be directly acknowledged)

“Ecoregions of New England” - Poster Peer Reviewers

- Charles E. Ferree (TNC)



- Patricia Swain (MA Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program)



- Bruce W. Thompson (NRCS-retired) and



- Peter D. Vaux (University of Maine)

